

REMARKS

The undersigned and Applicants would like to thank the Examiner and his supervisor for their courtesy and helpfulness in the telephonic interview of February 16, 2006.

Applicants now respond to each issue raised in the Examiner's Office Action.

With regard to the list of references cited in the specification, these references generally relate to storage units and related devices. Applicants submit that these references are not material to the issue of patentability and therefore, Applicants do not believe it is necessary to file an Information Disclosure Statement.

The Examiner has rejected claims 60 and 65-66 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, "as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention". Applicant has amended the claims in question to cure any deficiencies upon which this rejection is based.

The Examiner also has made the following rejections:

A) claims 57-58 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Albright et al. U.S. Patent No. 4,757,915 ("Albright");

B) claims 57-58 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Bienick U.S. Patent No. 6,422,673 ("Bienick");
and

C) claims 57 and 58 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bienick in view of Lye et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,227,636 ("Lye").

The Examiner has stated that claims 59, 61-64 and 67-76 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Examiner has stated that claims 60 and 65-66 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have amended the title of the invention so as to be commensurate with the claimed invention.

Applicants have amended claim 57 for purposes of clarity and to further patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references. The undersigned has provided the attached Exhibit A which contains a diagram that is based on Figures 10-13 of present application. Exhibit A contains labels that will aid the Examiner in his review of the amendments made to claim 57. Claim 57 now recites:

- 1) "the inclined section having a top side that is contiguous with the top side of the shelf panel and a bottom side,

2) "the inclined section being angulated with respect to the top side of the shelf panel by an inclination angle wherein the inclination angle is measured between the top side of the inclined section and the top side of the shelf panel and is greater than 90° and less than 180°",

3) "the front wall section having a front side and rear side, the front wall section being angulated with respect to the top side of the inclined section in accordance with a predetermined degree of angulation, the predetermined degree of angulation being measured between the top side of the inclined section and the front side of the front wall section, the predetermined degree of angulation being of such an angle that the front wall section is substantially parallel to the back panel and a space is created between the rear side of the front wall section and the bottom side of the inclined section.

Support for this amendment is found on page 13, lines 11-16 of the instant specification and in Figures 10-13.

The Examiner is referred to the attached Exhibit A which includes labels corresponding to the elements recited in claim 57. As recited in claim 57, the inclination angle of the inclined section allows a user to easily scoop parts stored on the top side of the shelf panel so as to remove those parts from the storage bin. Albright and Bienick do not disclose, teach or suggest the particular shelf panel structure recited in amended claim 57. Specifically, Albright and Bienick do not disclose, teach or suggest the "inclined section", "inclination angle" and "front wall section" as recited in claim 57. Thus, Applicants submit that Albright and Bienick do not anticipate claim 57. With respect to the recited "inclination angle", the

Applicants refer the Examiner to the Interview Summary of February 21, 2006 wherein the Examiners agreed that the proposed amendment would obviate the rejections based on the Albright and Bienick references. With respect to the Lye reference, the Examiner is referred to Figures 2 and 3, and column 3, lines 22-36 of Lye. Lye discloses tray 60 which has upstanding peripheral rim 68. Lye discloses that "[t]he presence of rim 68 advantageously minimizes the potential of any substance spilled upon upper surface 65 from falling off of platform 63". The Lye reference does not disclose, teach or suggest the particular shelf panel structure recited in amended claim 57. Specifically, Lye does not disclose, teach or suggest that "inclined section", "inclination angle" and "front wall section" as recited in amended claim 57. Therefore, Applicants submit that the combination of Bienick and Lye does not render obvious claim 57.

Amendments have been made to claims 58, 59, 60, 62, 64 and 65 for clarity, and for consistency with claim 57, and to address the issues under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, raised by the Examiner in the Office Action.

Claim 58 depends from claim 57. Since it has been shown that claim 57 is patentable over the cited references, Applicants submit that claim 58 is patentable as well.

Applicants submit that claims 57-76 are now allowable.

Applicants have submitted new claims 77 and 78. The Examiner

may refer to the attached Exhibit A when reviewing new claim 77. Claim 77 recites several elements recited in amended claim 57 and also recites that the "inclination angle" of the inclined section is between about 110° and about 170°. Dependent claim 78 recites that the inclination angle is about 135°. For the reasons mentioned in the foregoing discussion, Albright and Bienick do not disclose, teach or suggest the particular shelf panel structure recited in claims 77 and 78. Thus, Applicants submit that Albright and Bienick do not anticipate new claims 77 and 78. The Lye reference, as described in the foregoing remarks, discloses tray 60 which has upstanding peripheral rim 68. Tray 60 clearly does not have the particular shelf panel structure as recited in claim 77. Specifically, tray 60 of Lye does not have the "inclined section" and the particular range of "inclination angle" as recited in claim 77. Applicants submit that Lye actually teaches away from the particular shelf panel structure recited in claim 77. In the Lye reference, the peripheral, upstanding rim 68 of tray 60 does not constitute the claimed "inclined section" having "an inclination angle" that is between about 110° and about 170°. Lye has no need for such an inclined section. Thus, Applicants submit that Albright, Bienick and Lye, either taken alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest the particular shelf panel structure recited in claims 77 and 78.

It is submitted in view of these amendments and remarks that all grounds for rejection have been removed. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are therefore earnestly solicited. Applicant encourages the Examiner to call the undersigned attorney if there is any matter or issue that can be resolved through a telephone conference.

No fee is due for new claims 77 and 78.

A Petition for Extension of Time for one (1) month and the corresponding fee are also submitted herewith.

Respectfully submitted,

March 6, 2006

By: 
Raymond A. Nuzzo
Attorney of Record
Reg. No. 37199

Law Offices of Raymond A. Nuzzo, LLC
579 Thompson Avenue
East Haven, CT 06512
Tel: 203-467-7895
Fax: 203-467-7233